C.D. Howe Institute

# Trade Monitor

No. 5, May 1988 ISSN 0836-0820

## WOMEN AND FREE TRADE

by

Katie Macmillan

Public opinion surveys have revealed a "gender gap" in Canadian attitudes toward free trade. Women appear less likely than men to support the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement or to consider free trade a positive step for Canada.

Opponents of free trade and some women's groups maintain this gender gap indicates that Canadian women feel they will be worse off under free trade. They argue that free trade will create special problems for female employment and retard progress toward economic and social objectives that are important to women.

Economic analyses, however, do not support the contention that free trade's impact on women will be either substantial or negative. Any changes in women's employment and incomes, although not expected to be significant, will be positive. Real incomes will rise due to the lower prices that will result from reductions in trade barriers. Employment opportunities for males and females will also increase. Women workers could gain even more than men, since the female labor force is already heavily concentrated in the services sector, which is where the bulk of the new jobs generated by free trade probably will occur.

The arguments against free trade often have focused not on economic considerations but on its perceived impact on social institutions and Canada's ability to pursue independent policy objectives. Yet, a careful assessment of the Agreement indicates that free trade will neither hinder nor help to achieve social objectives of importance to women.

Should women worry about the effects of free trade, or are the opponents' arguments merely being used to attract attention to other objectives such as universal child care or pay equity? This question deserves careful and detailed consideration.

The purpose of this Trade Monitor is to investigate the concerns expressed about free trade and to assess whether free trade poses a legitimate threat to Canadian women. It begins by considering the likely impact of the Agreement on female employment in the services and

**Table 1**

**Female Employment by Industry, 1987**

| Industry | Employment | | Percentage of employees who are women | Percentage of working women employed in these industries |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Female (thousands) | Total | | |
| Goods-producing industries | 815 | 3,489 | 23% | 16% |
| Agriculture | 138 | 475 | 29 | 3 |
| Other primary | 36 | 291 | 12 | 1 |
| Manufacturing | 576 | 2,044 | 28 | 11 |
| Construction | 66 | 680 | 10 | 1 |
| Services-producing industries | 4,346 | 8,465 | 51 | 84 |
| All industries | 5,161 | 11,955 | 43 | 100 |

Source: Statistics Canada, The Labour Force, Cat. no. 71-001, December 1987, Table 71.

manufacturing sectors. It then examines the magnitude of the employment adjustment arising from free trade in general and the adjustment characteristics of female workers in particular. This is followed by a discussion of the implications of free trade for women's struggle for equality, and consideration of the consumer gains expected to arise from free trade and the significance of such gains for women. Finally, it looks at the Agreement's provisions relating to social services -- particularly child care.

## The Impact on Female Employment

It is difficult to predict how free trade will affect female employment. This is because of uncertainty about how employment will respond to free trade generally, and because no one is sure whether the jobs created or lost under free trade will belong to females or males.

One can glean some sense of the impact of free trade on female employment, however, by correlating predictions of employment effects by industry and the distribution of female employment by industry, shown in Table 1. The table indicates that over four-fifths of women in the labor force are employed in the services sector. Women hold 51 percent of jobs in the services-producing industries, as shown in Table 2. By way of contrast, women hold 28 percent of jobs in manufacturing, and only 11 percent of working women are employed in the manufacturing sector.

### Women in the Services Sector

Most of the new jobs that free trade will create -- the Economic Council of Canada estimates 72 percent -- are expected to be in the services sector. Since women hold more than half of the jobs in this sector, they are well positioned to benefit from this employment expansion. In fact, women hold 56 percent of the jobs in the services industries that are expected to experience the strongest

**Table 2**

**Employment in Services-Producing Industries, 1987**

| | Both sexes | Female | Female employment as percentage of total |
|---|---|---|---|
| | (thousands) | | |
| Transportation, communication and other utilities | 906 | 219 | 24% |
| Trade | 2,116 | 935 | 44 |
| Finance, insurance, and real estate | 695 | 419 | 60 |
| Community, business, and personal Services | 3,934 | 2,453 | 62 |
| Public administration | 814 | 321 | 39 |
| Total | 8,465 | 4,346 | 51 |

Source: Statistics Canada, Unpublished Labour Force Survey data.

employment gains: wholesale and retail trade; and business, community, and personal services.

To understand why most of the new jobs are expected to come in the services sector, one needs to know how the Agreement treats services and how it is likely to affect them, both directly and indirectly.

In the Agreement, the two countries are committed, in any new policy they undertake, to accord "national treatment" to those who provide services that the Agreement covers. National treatment means that although both countries remain free to regulate covered services independently and can maintain existing policies that discriminate against service operators on the basis of nationality, they cannot enact discriminatory practices in the future for covered services.

The Agreement's provisions on services apply to a broad range of commercial activities, including consulting, insurance, wholesale distribution, and real estate. There are also specific provisions for architecture, tourism, and computer and data transmission services.

The Agreement does not cover cultural industries, transportation, basic telecommunications, and government-provided services such as health, education, and child care. Since these services are not covered, governments can regulate, tax, or subsidize them in a way that discriminates against nationals of the other country, both now and in the future.

The Agreement will affect employment in the services industries directly through the new rules that will apply to these industries, and indirectly through the increased spending and investment that will occur as tariffs and other trade barriers affecting other industries are removed.

Free trade's direct impacts on services are likely to be small, for three reasons. First, many services, such as couriers, employment agencies, restaurants, nursing, teaching, and hairdressing, require a strong local presence and are

generally not traded across borders. Thus, such industries will be unaffected by the removal of trade barriers. And because the Agreement leaves immigration policies unaltered, Canadians will continue to be the primary providers of services sold to Canadians.

Second, as noted above, the Agreement excludes many service activities, such as the transportation, health, welfare, and education sectors.

Third, barriers that effectively prevent free trade will continue to exist for a number of services that the Agreement covers. Professionals such as real estate agents, for example, might not have their credentials recognized in one country, and thus would be precluded from operating in the other country's market. The exclusion of most government procurement from the terms of the Agreement will also limit the potential for increased services trade.

This is not to deny that some potential for increased trade in services exists. Some Canadian services industries, such as management consulting, engineering consulting, and architecture, are expected to increase their penetration of the U.S. market as a result of free trade. In addition, because trade in services is often associated with trade in goods, increased exports of goods to the United States could increase the demand for services such as export financing and technological and sales consulting.

Most of the jobs that free trade will create in the services sector will arise through indirect effects. Canadian consumers and businesses, whose real incomes will rise as a result of reductions in trade barriers, will increase their demand for and investment in services. Expanding Canadian businesses will require more legal, accounting, secretarial, and advertising services. Consumers will spend some of their increased income on restaurant meals, travel, and entertainment.

The demand for services depends largely on economic prosperity in local markets. For this reason, as productivity increases and economic growth occurs in the traded goods sector because of free trade, workers in the services industries -- a majority of whom are women -- stand to benefit from the resulting employment expansion.

## Women in Manufacturing

The bulk of the adjustment that is expected to occur as a result of free trade will take place in the manufacturing sector. The Economic Council of Canada predicts that although overall manufacturing employment will increase, some manufacturing industries will experience a net job loss.[1]

Only 11 percent of women in the labor force are employed in manufacturing. However, as shown in Table 3, more women are employed in trade-sensitive manufacturing industries such as textiles, clothing, leather, and electrical products than in industries on which the impact of free trade is likely to be positive or neutral.

Opponents of free trade have used this as a basis for arguing that the Agreement will disproportionately hurt women. Such claims, however, overlook the fact that male jobs in trade-sensitive industries outnumber female jobs by almost two to one. To the extent that jobs will be lost in these industries, therefore, the numbers suggest that twice as many men as women should be affected.

It is also misleading to imply, as have the Ontario Women's Directorate and others opposed to free trade, that the Agreement represents the most important threat to jobs in the textiles, clothing, footwear, and electronic appliance industries. Instead, the precarious employment conditions in these industries result more from competitive pressures from the newly industrialized countries, particularly those in Asia, than from

**Table 3**

**Female Employment in the Manufacturing Sector, 1984**

| Industry | Total employment | Women as percentage of total |
|---|---|---|
| Trade-sensitive industries[1] | 434,876 | 34% |
| Rubber and plastics | 60,901 | 26 |
| Leather | 24,378 | 59 |
| Textiles | 28,117 | 31 |
| Knitting mills | 31,955 | 47 |
| Electrical products | 135,951 | 34 |
| Chemical products | 87,802 | 27 |
| Miscellaneous | 65,772 | 39 |
| Other manufacturing industries | 1,287,168 | 24 |
| Total manufacturing | 1,722,044 | 26 |

1 Trade-sensitive industries are those determined by the Economic Council of Canada's analysis to suffer a net loss of jobs as a result of free trade. See Sunder Magun et al., Open Borders: An Assessment of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, Discussion Paper no. 344 (Ottawa: Economic Council of Canada, 1988).

Source: Statistics Canada, Manufacturing Industries of Canada: National and Provincial Areas, 1984, Cat. no. 31-203 (Ottawa, 1986).

competition by U.S. firms. Preferential, tariff-free access to the large, but still relatively protected, U.S. market could actually help many of these industries to compete in the world marketplace.

Free trade with the United States will not wipe out entire industries in Canada. Even the textile industry, which is considered to be among the most sensitive to trade-induced pressures, has demonstrated confidence in its competitive ability by undertaking capital investments of $400 million in 1987, more than ever before.

Free trade should not add significantly to the adjustment pressures already existing in the manufacturing sector.[2] To the extent that it creates jobs in industries that are less vulnerable to competition from low-wage countries, however, free trade will contribute to a more stable employment future for manufacturing workers.

**Women and Employment Adjustment**

Trade-Induced Adjustment in Context

Free trade is not expected to have a substantial impact on overall employment. The Economic Council of Canada, for example, estimates that an average of 18,800 jobs will be lost through permanent layoffs and 43,900 new jobs will be created as a result of free trade each year between 1989 and 1998 -- a net gain overall of 250,000 jobs by 1998, or 1.8 percent more than what would have occurred without the Agreement. The bulk of these new jobs will come in the services and primary sectors of the economy.[3]

Adjustments of this magnitude are small, however, compared with the job-switching that occurs as a matter of course in the economy: in any given year, some five million people change their employment status.[4] Even after allowing for voluntary quits or job changes, annual involuntary job losses still greatly overshadow the total number that may occur because of free trade. The Economic Council of Canada concludes that the Agreement will be responsible for less than 2 percent of the permanent job displacement occurring in any year.[5]

Trade pressures are, in any event, only one cause of employment change. In recent years, the Canadian economy has faced other pressures as well, such as shifting consumer demand, technological change, and exchange-rate fluctuations. To put the importance of these pressures in perspective, take the following case. In the four-month period between December 1, 1987, and April 1, 1988, the Canadian dollar appreciated by roughly 5 cents against its U.S. counterpart. The impact of this appreciation on some Canadian firms approximates that of the removal of a 6 percent tariff. The difference is that the currency change took place in four months, while the Agreement will remove tariffs over a period of years.

Women and Job Change

Women are well acquainted with labor force change. Between 1977 and 1987, the number of women in the Canadian labor force grew by 43 percent, from 4 million to 5.7 million. By comparison, the number of men in the labor force grew by 14 percent over the same period. The participation rate of women in the labor force increased to 56 percent in 1987 from 38 percent in 1977, and their share of the labor force increased from 34 percent to 43 percent over that decade.

Women have also predominated in the massive shift of jobs to the services sector, filling 1.4 million of the 2 million jobs created in that sector between 1977 and 1987. During the 1981-83 period, for example, while employment in the goods-producing sector declined by 371,000, it grew by 101,000 in services, and women accounted for 89 percent of those new services jobs.

Surveys conducted during the past ten years have shed considerable light on the labor force experiences of women and have challenged traditional views of women and job change. The average duration of unemployment is shorter for women than for men, for example, although women tend to move into and out of the labor market more readily than do men in response to changes in employment conditions. It also appears that women, more often than men, experience an increase in earnings when they move to another job.[6]

The fact that women appear to do better than men through job change undoubtedly reflects their increased education and more stable labor force attachment over the past decade. It also reflects their traditionally poorer earnings and lower-status jobs. In many circumstances, women have no where to go but up as far as job quality and earnings are concerned. If job change offers women an opportunity for better earnings and positions, then it should be promoted rather than resisted.

This is not to deny that labor adjustment can be disruptive and difficult. For instance, some women in the manufacturing sector lack the linguistic or job skills needed to move easily to a new position. For many of these women, the solution lies not with continued protection from U.S. imports, but with programs that address the root causes of the unequal opportunities they face.

Labor mobility and skills-upgrading programs can help women to move from poor jobs in declining industries to new opportunities elsewhere. In order to be effective, however, such programs must be sensitive to the unique characteristics and requirements of women workers -- including, for example, the fact that

women are generally less geographically mobile than men and often experience more interruptions in their participation in the labor force.

One can also attempt to break down stereotypes in the kinds of occupational training available to women by encouraging trainees to consider nontraditional pursuits. Although the federal government's Canadian Jobs Strategy program includes skills training, female representation remains very low, however. In 1986-87, for example, only 10 and 31 percent of those who participated in the Skills Shortages and Skill Investment programs, respectively, were women.[7]

The Canadian Jobs Strategy program has been refined to better assist workers who are in danger of losing their jobs as a result of trade and market pressures or technological change. For example, workers no longer have to be unemployed in order to qualify for some skills investment programs. Further work remains to be done, however. In the garment and textile industries, for example, where job losses are anticipated, a considerable number of female workers are unable to communicate effectively in either English or French. Although these workers could qualify for skills-upgrading programs if their jobs were in jeopardy, language training -- an important component of this education -- is provided only for new labor force entrants.

Ultimately, it is through better education, job training, and access to better jobs, not through protectionism, that women will improve their status in the workplace. An appreciation of where the employment vulnerabilities exist and of the requirements of those affected is critical to the development of responsive and effective adjustment programs for women workers.

## Free Trade and the Struggle for Equality

Canadian women currently earn, on average, only two-thirds as much as men and are poorly represented in those occupations offering the highest incomes and most promising career opportunities. Free trade cannot be expected to improve substantially the relative status of women in the workplace, but neither will it set back the cause of women's equality.

The Free Trade Agreement does not interfere with policies or institutions designed to further women's interests. For example, pay equity legislation, such as that proposed for Ontario, is fully consistent with the provisions of the Agreement. Affirmative action programs are also acceptable. In addition, as is discussed later, the Agreement does not compromise Canada's ability to pursue independent social policies.

Free trade's impact on women's struggle for equality in incomes and opportunities will depend on where jobs are created and lost in the economy. One can argue that by creating new jobs in growing sectors of the economy, a free trade environment is less exploitative of women and minority workers than is trade protectionism, and that it can help reduce inequalities in employment opportunities, particularly in the manufacturing sector.

For example, it is often women or minority workers who fill the new jobs that tariff and nontariff barriers create in import-competing manufacturing industries. These include some of the least attractive jobs the economy has to offer in terms of wages, working conditions, skill levels, and opportunities for advancement. Most women would probably choose not to stay in these positions if offered an alternative. To the extent that free trade creates positions in services and other growing industries, it will offer employment alternatives for women dependent on poor jobs in trade-threatened sectors. It could also help break the cycle whereby female and minority workers from one generation to the next are condemned to the employment conditions prevalent in some of the least competitive manufacturing industries.

Trade protectionism, with its focus on maintaining a status quo that many women workers find unacceptable, does not offer this potential.

**The Consumer Savings from Free Trade**

The consumer savings arising from the removal of trade barriers between Canada and the United States are particularly significant for women. All Canadians pay higher prices because of tariff and other trade barriers, which results in a lower standard of living than would otherwise be the case. The costs of protection weigh most heavily, however, on those who must devote a greater share of their income to expenditures on trade-protected items -- in short, on those who can least afford it.

Women generally have lower incomes than men, but often have greater responsibility for purchases. More than 60 percent of Canadians living below the poverty line are women, and in 1985, 60.4 percent of single mothers lived in poverty compared with only 11.1 percent of two-parent families.[8] Free trade will lower the price of many staples, thereby easing the pressure on low-income Canadians. For example, there is now a 25 percent tariff on most children's clothing items imported from the United States. The Agreement will eliminate this tariff over 10 years and result in sizable savings for Canadian families.

Opponents of free trade argue that the consumer savings have been grossly exaggerated, or even imagined, since businesses simply will not pass these savings on to the consumer. In fact, however, free trade will result in greater competition from U.S. firms, which will increase price competition in the Canadian market. For opponents to deny this displays an inconsistency found in their arguments -- that industries will lay off workers because of competition from U.S. firms, but will be able to maintain or increase selling prices in spite of that competition. Simply put, if, as the critics claim, free trade does not lower prices, then no mechanism exists through which the extensive job losses they predict will arise.

**Free Trade and Social Services**

Women are both the primary users and providers of social services in Canada. Thus, they have a particular interest in the quality and continued viability of these services. Many of the arguments against free trade center on its impact on social institutions and social policy-making. These arguments, however, often display a misunderstanding of what is in the Agreement and of the scope for independent policy action that both countries retain.

The Agreement's services provisions exclude most government-provided services, such as education, health, child care, and transportation. This means that both countries will continue to have complete autonomy in the regulation of these areas.

Opponents of free trade have argued that the Agreement really does include health-care services because certain service management industries, such as hospital and nursing home management, have not been excluded. It should be stressed, however, that the Agreement applies only to the <u>management</u> of these services, not to the standards or regulations under which health-care services are provided. Actually, the Agreement does little to improve the access U.S. health-care management firms have had for some time; it simply does away with the necessity of their having to establish a Canadian subsidiary. If U.S. management firms are able to expand their small Canadian foothold, they will do so independently of the Agreement, and they will continue to be constrained by Canadian health-care policies.[9]

Opponents of free trade also claim that it will eventually force Canada to dismantle such programs as Medicare and unemployment insurance, and that it will

preclude Canada from introducing initiatives, such as pay equity, that are not already in place in the United States. The truth is that not only does the Agreement exclude programs of this nature, but they will not be subject to countervail or other trade actions by the United States, provided they are universally available. To the extent that universal social programs raise the cost of doing business in Canada, this will be reflected in the exchange rate. If Canada's higher-cost social programs were to threaten its competitiveness, then a drop in the Canadian dollar, relative to its U.S. counterpart, could help restore Canada's ability to compete.

A strong public commitment to the well-being of its citizens is a feature of Canada's society. The Agreement in no way impairs Canada's ability to provide generously for the disadvantaged.

## Child Care and the Agreement

Child-care services deserve specific mention since this is an area in which the provisions of the Agreement have been frequently misinterpreted.

Since the Agreement's services provisions exclude child care, Canadian governments can regulate child-care operations -- both existing and new facilities -- in any way they choose. U.S. child-care firms could be required to meet criteria not required of Canadian firms in order to establish in Canada, or they could be prohibited from operating in Canada altogether.

Women's groups have expressed concern that the Agreement leaves open two back doors through which U.S. firms could increase their penetration of the Canadian market.

The first is through the investment chapter, which, under Article 1602, requires that Canada accord national treatment to investment in all service industries, even those, such as child care, that the Agreement's services provisions do not cover.

Article 1602, however, pertains only to investment. In Article 1602(c), Canada is not bound to accord national treatment in the regulation of noncovered services. In other words, although Canada must treat U.S. and Canadian firms the same when they acquire, establish, or sell a child-care investment, it is not obliged to do so as far as the regulation of a child-care operation is concerned.

Trade Monitor is an occasional publication of the C.D. Howe Institute. Its purpose is to assess the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and to contribute, in an objective, constructive manner, to the current bilateral trade debate.

As with all C.D. Howe Institute publications, the views expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Institute's members or Board of Directors.

Katie Macmillan, the author of this issue, is a Policy Analyst with the C.D. Howe Institute.

For further information, please contact:

Barry A. Norris
Director of Publications
C.D. Howe Institute
125 Adelaide Street East
Toronto, Ontario
M5C 1L7
(416) 865-1904

Quotation with appropriate credit is permissible. Single copies are available at $5.00 each.

ISBN 0-88806-230-3

The licensing of child-care facilities falls under provincial jurisdiction and is not affected by the Agreement. Some provinces, such as Alberta, have regulations effectively preventing the establishment of U.S. commercial child-care centers. Other provinces actively discourage or even prohibit commercial operations, regardless of nationality. Restrictions of this nature are permitted under the terms of the Agreement.

Another issue concerns U.S. firms' access to Canadian government child-care subsidies. Does the Agreement permit a province to subsidize Canadian commercial child-care centers directly but to deny funding to private, U.S.-owned operations?

Section 1402.9 of the Agreement says yes -- that the services provisions "shall [not] be construed as imposing obligations or conferring rights upon either party with respect to government procurement or subsidies." Furthermore, Canada's obligations with respect to national treatment apply to investment considerations only and do not extend to subsidies. Canadian governments are free to subsidize child-care facilities as they see fit, and to deny subsidies to U.S.-owned firms operating in Canada.

The second back door through which opponents claim U.S. firms could gain access to the Canadian market is Article 2011, the "Nullification and Impairment" clause. This clause, say the critics, would allow U.S. firms to challenge those aspects of the Agreement they do not like and to gain access that the Agreement would otherwise deny them.

The purpose of the Nullification and Impairment clause is to permit one country to activate the Agreement's dispute settlement procedures if it feels that the other country is applying any measure that denies any benefits that could reasonably have been expected to accrue under the Agreement. The clause has no relevance or potential application to child care, however, since the Agreement does not cover this service and, therefore, none of its benefits are expected to accrue to child care.

At the root of many of the concerns of women's groups over free trade is a belief that the Agreement somehow will make it more difficult to achieve child-care objectives such as a universal system or the elimination of commercial child-care centers. In fact, the Agreement does not constrain Canada's child-care policy choices. In no way does it oblige Canada to accept commercial child-care operations, U.S. or Canadian, nor does it affect Canada's ability to tighten child-care standards if this is deemed necessary. Canadian governments are free to subsidize child care as they see fit, and to deny subsidies to U.S. firms operating in Canada. In short, free trade does not stand in the way of a universal child-care system in Canada or the achievement of any other goals in the child-care area.

**Conclusion**

Free trade offers Canadian women a chance to improve their economic standing, both relatively and absolutely. Virtually every study on free trade predicts positive consequences for income and employment opportunities. On the employment side, women could well gain more than men because of the concentration of female employment in services industries, where the bulk of job growth is expected to occur.

Women have a demonstrated capacity to adjust to, and even profit from, changes in the workplace. While there will be some job losses, they are likely to occur predominantly in industries in which the major competitive threat comes not from the United States but from newly industrializing countries in Asia and elsewhere. Labor mobility and skills-upgrading programs can assist women to adjust to the new trading environment.

A careful reading of the Free Trade Agreement reveals that it poses no threat

to existing social policies and institutions. In the child-care area, for example, Canadian governments are free to maintain or increase quality standards, and can, if they wish, deny access to U.S. child-care enterprises. The Agreement also does not prohibit future policy initiatives directed at women. Pay equity, for example, is fully consistent with the provisions of the Agreement. Social services such as health, education, and welfare are not included in the Agreement. Female jobs in these industries, therefore, are under no threat, and Canadians are ensured continued access to the high-quality services to which they are accustomed.

Are women being manipulated by those who view the Agreement as a means to attract attention to other objectives? The answer is probably yes. To the extent that it calls attention to the circumstances and concerns of Canadian women, however, the debate over free trade and women can serve a useful purpose. In searching for solutions to inequalities in income and opportunity in our society, Canadians should focus on those elements truly detrimental to women's interests. The Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement does not fall into that category.

## Notes

1. Economic Council of Canada, Venturing Forth: An Assessment of the Canada-U.S. Trade Agreement (Ottawa, 1988), Table 2, p. 22.

2. Ibid, p. 25. See also Economic Council of Canada, Managing Adjustment: Policies for Trade Sensitive Industries (Ottawa, 1988), for a discussion of job creation and job loss in the manufacturing sector.

3. Sunder Magun, et al., Open Borders: An Assessment of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, Discussion Paper no. 344 (Ottawa: Economic Council of Canada, 1988).

4. Edward A. Carmichael, Reorienting the Canadian Economy, Policy Review and Outlook, 1986 (Toronto: C.D. Howe Institute, 1985) p. 16.

5. Economic Council of Canada, Managing Adjustment, p. 72.

6. See Garnet Picot and Ted Wannell, "Job Loss and Labour Market Adjustment in the Canadian Economy: Findings from a Special Survey," in Statistics Canada, The Labour Force, Cat. no. 71-001, March 1987; and A. Hasan and P. de Broucker, "Duration and Concentration of Unemployment," Canadian Journal of Economics 15 (November, 1982): 735-756. The Hasan and de Broucker analysis reveals that between 1976 and 1980, the average duration of unemployment fluctuated between 2.17 and 2.45 months for men and 1.94 and 2.16 months for females. The Statistics Canada study, Canada's Women: A Profile of Their 1986 Labour Market Experience, Cat. no. 71-205 (Ottawa, 1988), confirms that the average duration of unemployment for female labor force members is shorter than for males. The Picot and Wannell study finds that the average wage of women in new jobs exceeds that for previous jobs, but that the reverse is true for men.

7. Wendy McKeen, "The Canadian Jobs Strategy: Current Issues for Women" (Background paper prepared for the Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women, February, 1987), Appendix 2.

8. National Council of Welfare, Progress Against Poverty (Ottawa: Supply and Services Canada, 1987), p. 3.

9. Carolyn Tuohy, "Implications of the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement for the Health Services Sector in Canada," in Proceedings of the National Conference on the Free Trade Agreement, March 17-18, 1988, Centre for Research on Public Law and Public Policy, Osgoode Hall Law School, York University (forthcoming).

## Recent C.D. Howe Institute Publications

### Policy Review and Outlook, 1988

Focus on Follow-through, by Edward A. Carmichael and Katie Macmillan (February 1988). 104 pp.; $15.00.

### Policy Study Series

5 Business Strategies and Free Trade: Focus on Corporate Adjustment, edited by Maureen Farrow and Alan M. Rugman (May 1988). 99 pp.; $15.00.

4 Tax Reform: Perspectives on the White Paper, edited by Edward A. Carmichael (February 1988). 108 pp.; $15.00.

3 Social Policy in the 1990s: The Agenda for Reform, by Thomas J. Courchene (May 1987). 184 pp.; $12.00.

### Observation Series

31 Free Trade Areas, the European Experience: What Lessons for Canadian-U.S. Trade Liberalization?, by Victoria Curzon Price (October 1987). 58 pp.; $10.00.

30 Canadian-Japanese Economic Relations in a Triangular Perspective, edited by Wendy Dobson (April 1987). 55 pp.; $8.00.

### C.D. Howe Institute Commentary Series

15 A Canadian-U.S. Dispute Settlement Mechanism: Binding or Effective?, by Richard G. Lipsey and Alan M. Rugman (September 1987). 4 pp.; $2.00.

14 An Opportunity Missed: Analysis of the February 1987 Federal Budget, by Edward A. Carmichael (March 1987). 6 pp.; $2.00.

### Trade Monitor Series

4 Energy and the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, by Edward A. Carmichael (May 1988). 16 pp.; $5.00.

3 The Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and Foreign Direct Investment, by A.E. Safarian (May 1988). 16 pp.; $5.00.

2 The Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and the Auto Pact, by Paul Wonnacott (March 1988). 12 pp.; $5.00.

1 The Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and the Great Free Trade Debate, by Richard G. Lipsey (November 1987). 16 pp.; $5.00.